follow their custom, but this law cannot be applied; I think there is no reason in what they say. Since the House understands on the assurance of the two Devassies that there would be no calamity if we pass this Bill, why not members of other communities exercise their judgment in favour of natural justice and equity?

In this connection much has been said about Travancore affairs I may inform the House that there is already a letter from Mr. Kuruvilla who is a member of the Legislative Council there. He has introduced a Bill and it has been referred to a Select Committee. Some correspondence passed between us. He says—"Thank you for your letter and amendment enclosed. I glanced through the newspaper reports at the time to make myself sure. I shall be thankful if you will send me an official copy of the Proceedings. There is rather a strong opposition to my Bill, among certain sections of the public, but I do hope our Bills would pass through the Houses without difficulty".

In the objects and reasons it is stated as follows.—

"Indian Christian Intestate Succession Act was passed in 1092 about 23 years ago. Even at that time, there were strong differences of opinion as to the rights of women recognised in this Act especially in the case of the daughter, the widow and the mother. Now conditions have changed in the course of years and enlightened public opinion feels that change in the Law should be made so that women may claim equal rights with men. It is to carry this idea in effect that the amendments are suggested."

At the time when the Bill was under discussion, Mr. K. G. Parameswaran Pillai wrote as follows.—

"With all respect for the sentiment of the community which revolts against the idea of placing the daughters on a level of equality with the sons, I must confess I am unable to understand the justice or equity of treating the daughters as if they were merely dependants or servants of the family."

That is the opinion of Mr. K. G. Parameswaran Pillai. This is contained in the Objects and Reasons of the Bill of Mr. Kurivila. Therefore, if we pass this Bill, Travancore will also pass a Bill, because in the matter of the Child Marriage Restraint Act, they did so. I would request the House to consider the matter in an impartial spirit and exercise their judgment in the best manner so that natural justice may be done.

Motion put and lost, 8 for and 13 against

(2) THE COCHIN TENANCY ACT (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* Government have not been able to take definite decisions on the report of the Select Committee on the Tenancy Act (Amendment) Bill. The repercussions of the Cochin Verumpattamdars' Act on the peasantry at large have to be watched for some time before the present Bill affecting Kanam tenants is shaped. The landlords are agitating for a standardisation of the rate of interest in respect of Kanam transactions in view of the Cochin Agriculturists' Relief Act and the Usurious Loans Act. It is found that in certain kanam documents rates of interest vary even from 20 to 40 per cent. The Jenmi Member of the Select Committee pressed for a standardisation of the rate of interest but the Committee did not lend ear to it as it was thought that a disturbance of the rate of interest will upset the whole structure of kanam demises. Further, the pattam payable by Verumpattam tenants has been fixed in perpetuity. The Select Committee on the Tenancy Act (Amendment) Bill had no occasion to consider this aspect in relation to the Michavaram payable by the kanam tenants. There has also been a recent decision of the High Court, the effect of which will be that a kanam tenant may have to pay two rounds of renewal fee in a short space of time in cases where the last cycle of 12 years has ended within 12 years of the date on which the Act of 1113 came into force. I have not scrutinised that decision in detail. It is time therefore that instead of attempting a piece-meal legislation, all these questions are considered together and proper recommendations made. Government have therefore formed the opinion that it is better to review the whole position and bring in a Bill of their own rather than accept or oppose the present report which deals only with the question of renewal fee. A comprehensive legislation has therefore become necessary. The relief that was over-due to ner-kanam tenants was sought to be vouchsafed to them by the Tenancy Act of 1113, but the interpretation of the provision relating to renewal fee has resulted in a negation of the benefit intended by the legislature on account of the fact that the language adopted by the Legislature to give effect to their intention

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

does not lend itself to a proper expression of that intention. No time will be lost by Government in tackling these questions and a Committee will have to be constituted for the purpose. I have been authorised to make a statement before the House that Government are keen on reviewing the position of the kanam tenants in the light of the advantages derived by the Verumpattamdars and that a Bill for the purpose will be introduced as early as possible, when all these questions will be considered as a whole. The House may therefore be pleased to consider the aspects mentioned by me, take a broad view of the situation and postpone the further consideration of this bill.

Mr. T. P. Poulose *(Kanayannur)*: Sir, from what the Advocate-General has stated we cannot infer definitely as to when the Government will be undertaking the necesssary legislation. He simply stated that the Bill will be introduced "as early as possible."

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General)*: Positively before the next Vrischigam Session.

Mr. T. P. Poulose *(Kanayannur)*: I may say for the information of the House that on a previous occasion there was some such promise. I do not term it exactly a promise but, at least some hope was held out.....

Deputy President: Now an assurance is definitely given that the Bill will be brought positively in Vrischigam. In view of that I do not think there is any necessity for further discussion on this.

Mr. T. P. Poulose *(Kanayannur)*: Sir, when the Bill was moved at the second reading there was some hope held out by the Advocate-General that the Government really appreciated the hardships caused to tenants under the present Act as it now stands, and that the necessary amendments would be made to it. It was in 13 Cochin that the High Court pointed out the great injustice caused to nerkanam tenants. Twenty years have now elapsed and the position still remains unchanged.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General)*: It is not the fault of the Government alone. The present Act of 1113 specifically provided for it though it became infructuous by the language employed.

Mr. T. P. Poulose *(Kanayannur)*: Then, Sir, again in 23 Cochin the High Court has pointed out the same thing. Now for the past 20 years the High Court has been bringing this matter to the notice of the Legislature.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General)*: The case in 23 Cochin was decided in 1107 and we enacted the present Act in 1113 and it is only on account of a certain interpretation put by the Judges that the position remains the same. The Legislature enacted specific provisions to get over the difficulties pointed out in 13 Cochin and I am sure the Hon'ble Members will agree with me in that.

Deputy President: The Government have held out a promise that they will bring in a measure in Vrischigam.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri)*: Are we to take it that the Government will introduce a measure to remedy these defects if possible in Karkadagam.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General)*: I have already stated on behalf of the Government that the Government would bring in the necessary Bill in Vrischigam.

Mr. T. P. Poulose *(Kanayannur)*: The Government's reply was not definite.

Deputy President: The Advocate-General was very definite.

Mr. T. P. Poulose *(Kanayannur)*: In view of the assurance given by the Government, I do not move the Bill today.

(3) THE COCHIN CHILD MARRIAGE RESTRAINT ACT (AMENDMENT) BILL

മിസ്റ്റർ സി. വി. ഇയ്യു: സർ, ഞാൻ ശൈശവവിവാഹനിരോധന ആക്ട് ഭേദഗതി ബില്ല് ഇവിടെ അവതരിപ്പിക്കുന്നു. ഈ ബില്ല് അയച്ച കാലത്തുള്ളതിനേക്കാൾ കൂടുതലായി നമ്മുടെ രാജ്യത്തെ ജനങ്ങളെക്കുറിച്ചു അറിവു സമ്പാദിപ്പാൻ സാധിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ട്. കൊച്ചിരാജ്യത്തു കായലോരങ്ങളിലും ഗ്രാമപ്രദേശങ്ങളിലും തുരുത്തുകളിലും മലംപ്രദേശങ്ങളിലും നിവസിക്കുന്ന ജനങ്ങളെ സംബന്ധിച്ചിടത്തോളം എനിക്കു മുമ്പുണ്ടായിരുന്ന അറിവ് സീമാതീതമായി കഴിഞ്ഞ അല്പവർഷത്തിൽ വർദ്ധിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ട്. ഇന്നാണ് ഞാൻ ഈ ബില്ല് അവതരിപ്പിക്കാനനുവാദമപേക്ഷിക്കുന്നപക്ഷം ഈ ബിൽ ഞാൻ ഒരൊറ്റ വരികൊണ്ടു തീർക്കമായിരുന്നു. അതു ഇപ്രകാരമാകുമായിരുന്നു. അതായതു് "The Cochin child Marriage Restriant Act is hereby repealed" വിധവമാരുടേയും അനാഥകുട്ടികളുടേയും ഈ രാജ്യത്തുള്ള സംഖ്യ ക്രമാതീതമായിരിക്കുന്നു. ഈ കാരണത്താൽ ഈ രാജ്യത്തെ നിവാസികളിൽ ഓരോരുത്തരുടേയും വീടുകളിൽ സങ്കടങ്ങളും പ്രയാസങ്ങളും വളരെയധികം വർദ്ധിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ട്. ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly